

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Official Action mailed **April 8, 2005** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-10, 13-22, and 25-33. Claims 1-5, 9, 13-17, 21, and 25-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda et al. (USPN 6,424,992, hereinafter “Devarakonda”) in view of Kunzelman et al. (USPN 6,041,357, hereinafter “Kunzelman”) in further view of Davis et al. (USPN 6,367,009, hereinafter “Davis”) in further view of Haller et al (USPN 6,363,363 hereinafter “Haller”). Claims 6, 7, 10, 18, 19, 22, 30, 31, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, and Haller, and further in view of Fielder et al. (USPN 6,105,133, hereinafter “Fielder”). Claims 8, 20, and 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, and Haller, and in further view of Kennedy et al. (USPN 6,134,582, hereinafter “Kennedy”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 13, and 25 were rejected as being unpatentable over Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, and Haller. Applicant respectfully points out that the combined system of Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, and Haller teaches **re-routing** an established SSL from one server to another server as needs dictate and to form a multi-tier system (see Devarakonda, Abstract; Kunzelman, Abstract, Davis, Abstract, and Haller, Abstract).

In contrast, the present invention allows a single SSL session to be **simultaneously shared** by multiple servers (see page 8, lines 9-17 of the instant application). This is beneficial because it allows a client to simultaneously access the various related servers without having to establish a new SSL session. There is nothing within the combined system of Devarakonda, Kunzelman, Davis, and

Haller, either separately or in concert, which suggests sharing a single SSL session.


Accordingly, applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that the present invention allows a single SSL session to be simultaneously shared by multiple servers. These amendments find support on page 8, lines 9-17 of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 14-22, which depend upon claim 13, and claims 26-33, which depend upon claim 25, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Reg. No. 47,615

Date: April 25, 2005

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95616-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665